

Fairfax County Stormwater Advisory Committee
Stormwater Needs Assessment Project
Meeting #1
September 23, 2004, 7 – 9 p.m.
Fairfax County Government Center
Conference Rooms 2-3

Meeting Minutes

In Attendance:

Stormwater Advisory Committee:

Chris Champagne	Mary Beth Coya	Rev. Tim Craig
Kimberly Davis	Jessica Fleming	Harry Glasgow
Robert Jordan	Robert McLaren	Sally Ormsby
Greg Prelewicz	Lewis Rauch	Michael Rolband
Jeanette Stewart	Mark Trostle	Russell Wanek

Consultants:

Elizabeth Treadway
Doug Moseley
Maureen Hartigan

County Staff:

Jimmie Jenkins
Carl Bouchard
Fred Rose
Vishnu Seri

Paul Shirey
Krystal Kearns
Scott St. Clair

Special Guests:

Penny Gross, Mason District Supervisor

Meeting Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Review of Agenda
3. Role and Mission of the Committee
4. Overview of the "Watershed Community Needs and Funding Options Study" Project
5. Challenges of Managing Stormwater in Fairfax County

Welcome and Introductions

Supervisor Gross opened the meeting with a welcome message for the committee members, noting the timeliness and importance of the County's review of stormwater management programming and the alternatives available to fund it. Mr. Jenkins reiterated Supervisor Gross' sentiments and thanked the members of the committee for their service. After each of the committee members introduced themselves, Mr. Bouchard introduced the County staff associated with the project as well as the members of the County's consulting team from AMEC Earth & Environmental that will be working with the committee on this project. Mr. Bouchard asked each of the committee members to offer their thoughts to the group on their perspective and their expectations for the project.

Review of Agenda

Ms. Treadway offered a brief overview of the meeting's agenda. She noted that before this meeting concluded, the committee would have the opportunity to schedule future meetings, review the statement included in the handout material on mission and review the process for committee work. She noted that the County and the consulting team would do everything possible to keep each committee meeting to two hours. The meetings will only continue beyond two hours with the consent of the committee members.

Role and Mission of the Committee

Mr. Moseley led a brief review of the mission of the committee. He noted that this advisory committee's role is to:

- Provide advice and input into identifying the problems, needs and issues within the current stormwater program;
- Assist in establishing priorities for stormwater services in Fairfax County;
- Provide advice on level and extent of stormwater service, investment in the capital program, approach to water quality protection services, and other key policies that will guide the stormwater program;
- Review policy on stormwater funding mechanisms, including user fees, and explore rate methodologies, rate structures and rate bases; and
- Make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors regarding the dedicated funding needed to address stormwater needs in the community.

He noted that the Committee's recommendations would address a program that can meet community needs and expectations, including how to fund it, but that the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors will make the ultimate decision on how to proceed. Mr. Moseley covered a series of basic meeting ground rules with the committee members. The ground rules are designed to help the work flow of the meetings and to allow for full and active participation by each committee member. Mr. Moseley asked if the Committee members had any additions or modifications they wanted to make to the list of Ground Rules. None were offered.

Mr. Moseley requested that the Committee establish a schedule for the five remaining meetings. After a brief discussion, the Committee decided that the second Tuesday of the month would be the best meeting day and that evening meetings were preferable to other meeting times. In addition, the committee decided that the Government Center was as convenient a meeting location as any. Based on this input, the committee's next meeting will be Tuesday, October 12, 2004 at 7 P.M. in the Fairfax County Pennino Building (opposite the Fairfax County Government Center). Future meeting dates were set for November 9, 2004; December 14, 2004; January 11, 2005; and February 8, 2005.

Mr. Moseley concluded the agenda item with a brief discussion of the process for committee work. The County and the consultant will develop draft policy discussion papers for the committee's consideration and distribute the draft papers to the committee one week prior to each meeting. The policy issue will then be addressed at the next



committee meeting where the committee will provide input, feedback, raise questions, and discuss the issues. With the feedback from each discussion, the County and the consultant will then revise the policy discussion paper and build a policy statement from the discussion. The policy statement will then be reviewed at the following committee meeting, which should lead to general agreement on the statement by the members. Committee members asked what was meant by the term “agreement” on policy statements. Mr. Moseley noted that it was not necessary to gain 100 percent consensus on each policy, but rather to gain informed consent, or a general agreement that the policy statement accurately reflects the thoughts of the committee.

Overview of the “Watershed Community Needs and Funding Options Study” Project

Mr. Bouchard opened the overview with a brief discussion of stormwater management in Fairfax County and a review of the County’s various stormwater-related initiatives dating back to the 1970’s. He noted the County’s recent stormwater strategic planning effort, which expressed, among other needs and ideas, the concept that service levels for stormwater programs should be based on actual needs and those service levels should be supported by adequate and stable funding. That finding, in part, contributed to the County undertaking this needs assessment project.

Ms. Treadway covered some of the history and findings from the first phase of this project. In the first phase, the County and the consultant clarified some of the County’s stormwater management challenges and identified some potential funding strategies for stormwater service. Ms. Treadway reviewed some of the first phase findings, noting current services provided by the County, outlining the physical system the County has the responsibility to manage, and outlining some of the County’s management challenges. Those findings were incorporated into a phase I final report, which was presented to the Board of Supervisors on July 16, 2004. The first phase of the report is available on the Internet at <<http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/stormwater>>.

One recommendation made to the Board was the creation of this advisory committee and the County staff was authorized to proceed with the second phase of the project, centering on finalizing program recommendations based on public input, completion of the cost analysis and funding options analysis, and reporting the study’s findings back to the Board in February 2005.

Challenges of Managing Stormwater in Fairfax County

To follow up on the points raised in the final report for phase I of the project, Mr. Rose presented a comprehensive overview of the challenges that the County currently faces in addressing its stormwater management concerns. Mr. Rose focused on the physical system itself, noted the regulatory mandates for water quality the County faces, and also noted the County’s recent flooding, stream stabilization, and stream scour and erosion concerns. He highlighted some of the County’s recent stormwater management studies, including the Stream Protection Strategy (SPS) and the recently completed stream physical assessment. He noted that the County has watershed plans underway for several of the County’s subwatersheds.

Participants noted that the number of houses that have suffered flood damage seemed low. They also noted that road flooding may be an issue beyond the County’s ability to influence since any road drainage improvements would fall under the responsibility of



the Virginia Department of Transportation. However, it was also acknowledged that the County has a vast infrastructure to maintain and acknowledged the problems presented by Mr. Rose.

Additional Discussion

Prior to Mr. Rose's presentation, participants provided feedback and recommended clarifications on the "Frequently Asked Questions" paper that was in the background materials distributed to the Committee prior to the meeting. Committee members noted that on the topic of erosion and sediment control, the County may wish to include information on bare ground as a potential source. They also noted that the County may wish to include "the planting of native species" under the section discussing what homeowners can do to improve water quality, noting that turf grass may not have as much water quality benefit as native vegetation. Finally, participants noted that the County may wish to include a broader definition under the section on "what is stormwater runoff?" to include a description of how stormwater moves across the land and ends up in the County's creeks and streams, including a some description of the impact that stormwater best management practices (BMPs) can have on the quality and quantity of stormwater runoff. This feedback will be addressed in an update of the FAQ.

The meeting adjourned at 9:05 PM.

Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Fairfax County Stormwater Advisory Committee will be held on October 12, 2004 at 7 P.M. in the Fairfax County Pennino Building.